



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,022	07/13/2001	Chon-si Lai	6816.US.01	2509

25755 7590 09/20/2002

ROSS PRODUCTS DIVISION OF ABBOTT LABORATORIES
DEPARTMENT 108140-DS/1
625 CLEVELAND AVENUE
COLUMBUS, OH 43215-1724

EXAMINER

FUBARA, BLESSING M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/905,022

Applicant(s)

LAI ET AL.

Examiner

Blessing M. Fubara

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner acknowledges receipt of declaration and IDS filed 09/19/01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no description for "modified cellulose" in the written description.
4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims have not defined what "modified cellulose" is.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henningfield et al. (US 5,221,668).

Henningfield teaches a liquid nutritional product comprising a protein system of about 20-30% lactalbumin hydrolysate, about 60-70% partially hydrolyzed caseinate and about 8-14% L-arginine, a lipid system and a source of carbohydrate and the calorie is provided by the proteins, lipids and carbohydrates (claims 1-18). The liquid nutritional product further comprises amino acids, vitamins and fatty acids (claims 9-26), and Table 1 shows that the nutritional product also comprises iota carrageenan. See also abstract and Tables 1-4.

Henningfield clearly teaches the liquid composition of the claimed invention except that the concentrations of the ingredients of the prior art varies from the claimed ranges but differences in concentrations will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art. While differences in concentrations will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence to support the criticality of such a concentration, it is noted that the concentrations of the ingredients in the liquid nutritional product of the prior art overlaps or are encompassed by the concentration ranges claimed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prepare the liquid nutritional product of Henningfield since differences in concentrations will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence to support the criticality of such a concentration. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to optimize the concentration of the prior art that would provide energy and nutrients essential to optimal healing and immunocompetence of trauma patients (Henningfield, column 1, lines 44-58). “[W]here the general conditions of a

Art Unit: 1615

claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.”

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Greenberg (US 5,260,279) teaches a nutritional feed composition that comprises caseinate, maltodextrin, vitamins, soluble fiber, minerals, carrageenan, canola or corn oil, flavors, citrate, water and lecithin (abstract and examples 1-4).

Brog (US 4,397,927) teaches a composition comprising caseinate, corn syrup solids or cane sugar, fat, whey solids, lactose, protein and minerals (abstract and examples II and IV).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 15 is allowable because the prior art does not teach method of reducing creaming in a nutritionally complete liquid formula by incorporating about 45 –85% w/w protein caseinate and about 15-55% w/w soy or whey protein. Mulchandani et al. (US 5,700,513) teaches a liquid nutritional product that is substantially free of creaming, the composition comprises iota carrageenan/microcrystalline cellulose/carboxymethyl cellulose blend (abstract and column 4, lines 54-66). However, the composition of Mulchandani does not contain the second protein, soy or whey.

8. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicants' cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicants may become aware in the specification.


Art Unit: 1615

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blessing M. Fubara whose telephone number is 703-308-8374. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. (Monday to Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on 703-308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3592 for regular communications and 703-305-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1234.

Blessing Fubara
September 18, 2002


THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600